

So when we look at what happens when we have 12 to 20 or more million illegals in America, what are the effects on our society? First, they are delivering 90 percent of the drugs from or through Mexico. And some of them at least touch the delivery of every illegal drug that's delivered in the United States of America while that's going on.

What is accompanied by the illegal drug trade? Violence, murder, theft, rape, all of those things that go along with crime are wrapped up and associated with the illegal drug distribution. And the people that are illegally distributing drugs that are in the United States illegally are also, however inadvertently, the channel of their work is enabled by, and not always willfully, and sometimes even unknowingly, it's enabled by the illegal community in the United States. It becomes an underground railroad for illegal people and illegal drugs that are pouring through, from and through Mexico into the United States. And it is something that brings about a high amount of death and destruction and diminishment of human capital, human resources, and human potential. That's why we outlaw those illegal drugs in the first place.

It doesn't mean that all the people that are involved in that are willfully evil or willfully trying to undermine our society. It might be inadvertent. But they are part of the problem. And if we are to have the rule of law, we have to enforce the rule of law. And to imagine that when law enforcement comes in contact with people who are here illegally that we would be unwilling to put them back into the condition that they were in at the time they broke the law is unconscionable for a rule-of-law Nation to think such a thing.

Think in terms of this: if someone walks into the bank and robs the bank and would walk out of that bank with all of the loot, and we would interdict them with our law enforcement and decide, well, you really only want to provide for your family, so we are going to let you go on here because we don't have the will to stop you at this point. Or our immigration laws, simply deporting people is the equivalent of putting them back in the condition they were in before they broke the law. It's the equivalent of taking a bank robber and saying you don't get to keep the money, but we are going to take you out of the bank and set you outside the door and let you go. That's the equivalent of deportation.

It is we put people back in the condition they were in before they broke the law. It's like taking a bank robber out of the bank, not letting them keep the loot, and you set them outside the door and say, okay, go. You are free to go. It's as if you never broke our law. That's what deportation is. It is not Draconian. It is not harsh. It is not cruel and unusual punishment. It is de minimis that we can do if we are going

to enforce the law. And if we are not willing to put people back in the condition they were in before they broke our immigration law, then we cannot have enforcement of our immigration law whatsoever.

It doesn't work to set a standard of amnesty that's been advocated by President Bush, President Obama, by many of the leaders over here on the left side of the aisle that we should give people a path to citizenship, make them pay a fine, force them to learn English. That seems a little odd to me, how you force somebody to learn a language and require them to pay their back taxes. Those are the minimum standards for somebody who would come into the United States legally in the first place.

If you want to become an American citizen, get in line. Get in line in a foreign country. Don't jump the line. Don't jump the border. And when you do that, and you go take your citizenship test—first, you have to pass the test that asks the question what's the economic system of the United States of America? And the answer is free enterprise capitalism. That's a little heads up there, Madam Speaker, on that one.

But when people come into the United States legally, they are required to learn English. If they want to become a citizen, if they want to go through the naturalization process, they are required to learn English. They are required to demonstrate proficiency in English in both the written and the spoken word. They have to understand our history and understand those principles that made America great. And we are not going to naturalize somebody that didn't pay their back taxes.

And the idea of a fine for being in the United States illegally, and that's the only other condition that we would add, whether that would be pay a fee of \$1,500—I remember when it started out to be \$500. And then \$500 seemed like a pittance, so they raised it to \$1,000 and then \$1,500. And under the Bush administration we had the discussion and the argument that their position was, well, it's not amnesty if they have to pay a fine. Oh, really? If the fine is cheaper than what you have to pay a coyote to sneak into the United States is it really a fine? And does the fine replace the penalty that exists for violating Federal law? And I say no.

If you grant people the objective of their crime, it's amnesty. To grant amnesty is to pardon people for the violation of the law and grant them the objective of their crime. That's what amnesty is. And so if we are going to have amnesty, let's be honest about it, Madam Speaker. Let's ask the people in this Congress, the President of the United States, the executive branch of government, and the people in the United States Senate that are now crafting up legislation are you for or against amnesty. If they want to support amnesty, it's fine with me if they

will just admit that. And then we can have a debate as to what degree of amnesty they are going to advocate.

But it's offensive to the American people to hear United States Senators or Members of the House of Representatives, Congressmen and -women, or the President of the United States, or his spokesmen or -women, argue that amnesty isn't amnesty when we know very well what amnesty is. Pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crimes. That's amnesty.

President Reagan understood it. He admitted amnesty was amnesty. He signed the amnesty bill in 1986. Yes, he let me down, but he was honest about it. And we haven't been honest during the second half of the Bush administration, and we certainly aren't honest during the Obama administration, this first third or so of the Obama administration about amnesty or immigration.

And so here are my concerns, that 90 percent of the illegal drugs that are consumed in the United States come from or through Mexico. Of all the violence that pours forth from that, it costs American lives dozens and dozens, in fact by the hundreds, every year Americans that die at the hands of illegals that are here in the United States of America illegally. That's the definition. And if we would be effective in enforcing immigration law, those people who died at the hands who are here illegally would still be alive.

When the school bus wrecked in southwest Minnesota and we lost four or five young girls there because it was caused by an accident by an individual who had two or three times been interdicted by law enforcement in the United States but was turned loose again, those girls would be young women today. They would be alive today. And their parents know that. It happens over and over hundreds of times. In fact, it's happened thousands of times since we failed to enforce our immigration laws.

So what do we do? We put together the will to enforce our immigration laws. The American people rise up and make the argument that we are going to have the rule of law, that we are going to shut off all illegal traffic at the border. We are going to force all that traffic through the ports of entry.

It's been a little while since we have talked about the necessity of building a wall and a fence on the southern border. Someone said to me we can't build 2,000 miles of fence. Yes, we could. We could build 2,000 miles of triple fencing. We could put sensors on it. We could put lights on it. We could build roads in between. We could patrol it. We could enforce it. We can fix it so nobody gets through all that. Yes, we can. And for the people that will argue if you build a 20-foot fence I will show you a 21-foot ladder, that's got to be the silliest and the weakest and the most specious argument I have heard here on the floor of the United States Congress. I have heard the Secretary of